

2005 NPS & Stormwater Media Campaign Assessment (Omnibus Phone Survey)

SUMMARY

The ThinkBlueMaine media campaign was even more successful this year than last year. In our first year (2004), 14% of respondents in a state-wide, statistically significant phone survey correctly identified an image or message from our TV or radio ads; this year it jumped to 24%. Almost 1/4 of Maine adults recalled our ads - off the top of their head! This recall occurred even when the ads hadn't run for almost 2 months in some locations (2005).



We had great responses such as

- "I've heard radio commercial ... it's the fish going "I can't breath" because their gills are plugged with the soil from the run-off"
- "Duck commercials, pollution turns into ducks and floats down stream. Radio fish talking to each other about storm runoff."
- "The commercial with the ducks, be conscious of what's going in the storm drains."
- "Blue water, keep Maine clean, uses rubber duckies, pet waste gets into the water and gas and oil and other runoff things caused by people that causes pollution in our waterways."

Our target audience (middle aged, middle income, college educated) were more likely to be concerned about stormwater, have heard and remembered our message, and offered actions they had taken or planned to take to reduce pollution.

Although the campaign was not designed to urge people to particular actions, 35% of respondents offered specific practices (vs. 26% in 2004). Although the actions are self-reported (not independently verified), they do show an increase in awareness and stewardship in our population.



The NPS specific component of soil erosion appears to have reached a point where it is now constantly a top of the mind pollutant (6% in 2004 and 5% in 2005).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Since the ads continue to be effective at getting our target audience's attention, conveying the message, and people retaining the message for a period of time beyond the air play, it is worth continuing to use the ad. Since the ads only play seasonally, our consultant believes we can continue to use the same ads without boring our audience.

The widespread awareness that stormwater affects our waterways combined with the relatively large numbers of folks mentioning trash, litter, vehicles and dumping chemicals as being common problems, indicates that a program to stencil storm drains will reinforce the Stormwater message.

Soil erosion, pesticides, fertilizers and herbicides are recognized by at least a small segment of the population as a source of water pollution. Therefore, stormwater (MS4) communities are not starting from scratch with their target audience. A portion of the audience presently recognizes these elements as potential pollution sources. This should allow the Communities to apportion resources a bit more heavily on efforts to change behaviors and a bit less on raising awareness

Pet waste is not a top of the mind source of water pollution; no respondent identified it as a source of water pollution. MS4 communities who wish to focus on pet waste pickup will need to spend resources to educate Mainers that pet waste is a source of water pollution as well as resources on getting behavior change.

FINDINGS

The Survey

The current Maine Survey is based on telephone interviews conducted from October 17th – November 1st, 2005 with 401 randomly selected adults throughout Maine. The percentages reported for the entire sample are within plus or minus 4.9% that would be found if all telephone households in Maine were interviewed.

1) What do you think is polluting the water in your neighborhood?

- Litter and trash (10%)
- Septic systems, sewers and sewage (9%)
- Dumping chemicals, waste products and trash (7%)
- Boating, water sports and boat discharges (7%)
- Automobiles and vehicles emissions (6%),
- Industrial/municipal use (5%)
- Soil or erosion 5%
- Fertilizer, pesticides, herbicides 5%.

In October 2004, automobiles and vehicles and related issues (12%) and people dumping chemicals, waste products and trash (11%) were the most commonly mentioned practices that contribute towards the pollution of our rivers, lakes and streams.

In October 2003, litter and trash (11%) and people dumping chemicals, waste products and trash (10%) were the most commonly mentioned practices that contribute towards the pollution of our rivers, lakes and streams.

Analysis of Stormwater Issues and Practices:

Those with some college education were more likely than other education groups to indicate that autos, rec vehicles, oil, gas and emissions contribute towards the pollution of our waters (11%, compared to 6% of those with a high school education or less and 3% of those who have a college degree or more).

Those with a high school education or less were more likely than other education groups to indicate that litter and trash contribute towards the pollution of our rivers, lakes and streams in the state (13%, compared to 11% of those with some college education and 7% of those who have a college degree or more.)

Erosion, Fertilizer, Pesticides, & Pet Waste

Age Break Downs

5% overall said soil or erosion

2% of 18-29, 6% of 30-39, 0% of 40-49, 7% of 50-59 and 60+

5% overall said pesticides, fertilizer, herbicides (do they mean lawn care products?)

2% of 18-29, 5% of 30-39, 10% of 40-49, 5% of 50-59 and 60+

No one said pet waste

Gender Break Downs

Said soil or erosion

Females 4%, males 5%

Pesticides, fertilizer, herbicides (lawn care products?)

Female 4%, male 6%

Income Break Downs

Soil or erosion

4% of <\$30K and \$30-60K, 3% of \$60K+

Pesticides, fertilizer, herbicides (lawn care products?)

1% of <\$30K, 4% of \$30-60K, 11% of \$60K+

Education Break Downs

Soil and erosion

High school or less 4%, some college 4%, college grad 6%

Pesticides, fertilizer, herbicides (lawn care products?)

High school or less 3%, some college 6%, college 9%

By Region

Soil & erosion

South 4%, Coastal 3%, Central 7%, North 3%

Pesticides, fertilizer, herbicides (lawn care products?)

South 10%, Coastal 2%, Central 4%, North 2%

Conclusions

Remembering that the margin of error is 4.9% ...

People list a number of practices as significant water quality problems that are not so important: litter, septic systems, boating... Important issues for us (soil erosion, lawn chemicals, lack of buffer strips,...) are still lower in responses.

Soil erosion - No change from last year (6% in 2004, 5% in 2005). The good news is that it continues to be on people's radar and is mentioned by 1 in 20 respondents off the top of their head as a source of water pollution.

Pesticides, fertilizers, herbicides - Ties with soil for top of the mind responses. There are differences in demographics on who believes these products are a source of water pollution. Those 40-49, making over 60K, college educated and living in southern Maine were the most likely to name these products off the top of their head. The irony is they are pre-

sumably the people most likely to be using these products. Since these products are recognized as a source of water pollution, advocates for best management practices can spend resources more on changing behavior and less on raising awareness.

Pet waste - with no respondent mentioning pet waste as a source of water pollution, there is an uphill challenge to get it on people's radar. Energy and resources will be needed to both make people aware of the issue and get them to change their behavior.

2) How much of an impact does stormwater have on our waterways in Maine?

More than eight in 10 Mainers think stormwater impacts our waters. (There was no significant change in response over the 3 surveys.) If one were to add the Major Impact with Some what of an impact there is no difference in age groups, gender, income or education. However if one were to look regionally, those in the coastal area are more likely to say stormwater has a major or somewhat of an impact (92%) compared to Central (86%), South (81%) and North only 75%. (Could this be because of the shell fish industry that is closed after major storm events?)

If one were to look at those who say stormwater is a major impact there are differences. Those 30-39, more educated and living in the coastal region are more likely to say stormwater has a major impact.

Conclusions

Generally, Mainers remain concerned about stormwater.

We picked the correct target audience for our campaign (the ones most likely to be concerned and take action) based on responses to this question. Those with a college degree or more were more likely than other education groups to indicate that stormwater has a major impact on the quality of the waterways in Maine (44%, compared to 26% of those with a high school education or less and 36% of those who have some college education).

3) Have you seen or heard anything on water pollution in last 30 days? (Note: that in the 2 northern markets the ads had not run for close to 60 days.)

Overall 39% of the population recall seeing or hearing an ad about water pollution in the last 30 days. Of the 39% who recall an ad, 62% identified messages or images from our ads. Thus 24% of the Maine population recall seeing or hearing our ads, up 10 points from last year!

Those 18-29 were least likely to recall hearing or seeing anything. (33%) vs. 41-43% for other age groups. (We aren't reaching the 18-29 year olds, but they aren't our target.)

Men were more likely to have seen or heard something 44% v. 34%.

Lower income were least likely to have seen or heard (34%) vs. 43 - 44%.

Those with a high school education or less were least likely to have seen or heard an ad (23%) vs. 48% some college & 51% college or more. (Hit our target.)

Southern residents were more likely to have seen or heard (48%) than other regions. It was in southern Maine that the ads were actually running during the survey. The Bangor and Aroostook County media buys were in July/August so a drop-off in responses would be expected. (Coastal 29%, Central 39%, North 33%)

62% of those who said they had either seen or heard an ad mentioned topics, words or images from our ads. Of the 31% who said they had seen an ad with rubber ducks, when asked what the message was, 16% also were able to provide our message. Thus, of the 62% who said they had heard or seen something, 46% specifically recalled our message! (15% of those who had seen or heard an ad and said they recalled rubber ducks were unable to provide the message in the ad.)

Got the message, not just remembered seeing something on water (from radio or TV)
The 30-39 year olds got the message the best (60%), 40-49 year olds (54%); 60+ (46%); 18-29 (45%); 50-59 (33%).

Men (53%) recalled the message more than women (42%).

The North (61%) recalled the message better than any other region of the state even though the commercial hadn't run there for almost 60 days and was still running in Southern Maine (42%). Central (52%) and Coastal (32%).

Those with an income of \$60K+ got the message (60%), while those making \$30-60K responded 48%, and those under \$30K only 37%.

Education had little impact on the respondent's ability to recall the message: high school or less 48%, some college 43%, and college + 51%.

15% could recall seeing our ads but were unable to recall the message. Those most likely to recall the ads but not the message were 40-49 years old, female, living in Southern Maine, who had some college and were making over 60K.

Conclusions:

More people than ever recall our ad, up 10 points to 24% or a quarter of Maine's adult population. We can confidently say that 46% of those who recall our ads understood the message or 18% of Maine's adult population.

Over all we hit our target audience (middle aged, upper income, college educated). This is a successful ad at getting Maine residents' attention about the message of stormwater pollution.

4) Respondents were asked if they had seen the TV ad about stormwater, rubber ducks, rivers....

When prompted, 72% recall seeing our ad.

Those between 50-59 (80%) were the most likely to say they had seen the ad vs. 77% of 30-39; 76% of 60+; 70% of 40-49 with the 18-29 the least likely at only 56%. (We hit our target.)

Those making less than \$30K were most likely to recall ad (76%), vs. \$30-60K 71%, and \$60K+ 69%. (The margin of error of 4.9% makes these fairly close.)

Those with a college education or some college were the most likely to recall the ad (75%) vs. high school or less (68%). (Hit our target).

Interestingly - there is no difference in the regions of the state, even though the ad ran in Arostook County and Bangor markets in July/August and Oct./Nov in the southern Maine market. (South 73%, Coastal 72%, Central 71%, North 72%).

Conclusion:

Even though our ads hadn't run for almost 2 months, when prompted those in the north still recall seeing the ad. The ads are memorable.

5) Respondents were asked if they heard a radio ad about runoff, storm drains, pollution ...

When prompted, 38% recall hearing our ad.

Those 18-29 (51%) were most likely to recall hearing an ad vs. 30-39 (39%), 50-59 (38%), 40-49 (35%), 60+ (31%).

Men (46%) were more likely than women (31%).

Lower income (41%) were more likely to have heard than \$30-60K (37%) and \$60K+ (34%). (Although margin of error is 4.9%, it appears there is a trend to the lower income respondents being more likely to recall radio spot if prompted.)

Those with some college or a college degree were more likely to recall hearing a radio ad (40% and 42% respectfully) vs. high school or less 33%.

Those living in northern Maine were the most likely to recall hearing the radio ad in the last 30 days (45%) even though it hadn't been run in almost 60 days. Southern Maine residents 42%, Central 31%, and Coastal 30%.

Conclusion:

Radio may be more effective at reaching younger, lower income, men and college educated.

6) Did you already take or do you plan to take action to reduce stormwater pollution?

Four in ten Mainers (40%) have already taken or plan to take action to reduce storm water runoff while 60% have not. In October 2004, only 32% of respondents took action or planned to take action to reduce storm water runoff while 68% did not.

7) What action have you taken or plan to take?

35% of respondents gave a specific action; this is an increase from 26% the previous year.

Of those who have already taken or plan to take action, 4% have been or will be careful about oil leaks and chemicals, 4% have built or plan to build rock walls, fences or trenches to divert runoff, 4% have made or will make sure their property is clean so nothing runs off and another 4% have used or will use organic fertilizer, or none at all.

Of those that took action or plan to take action to reduce storm water runoff, men were more likely than women to say that they built or plan to build rock walls, trenches, to divert runoff (7% vs.2%).

Of those that took action or plan to take action to reduce storm water runoff, those with some college education were more likely than other education groups to indicate that they will not dump things into drains and will keep drains clear (5%, compared to 0% of those with a high school education or less and 1% of those with a college degree or more).

Of those that took action or plan to take action to reduce stormwater runoff, those with an annual household income of \$60K or more were more likely than other income groups to indicate that they have used or will use natural or organic fertilizer, or no fertilizer at all (11%, compared to 1% of those with an annual household income of less than \$30K and 1% of those with an annual income of \$30-60K).

Conclusions

Although the actions are self-reported (not independently verified), they do show an increase in stewardship in our population. And the campaign was not designed to urge people to particular actions, but we have a significant number offering specific practices that reduce stormwater pollution.

For More Information:

Kathy Hoppe
Maine Department of Environmental Protection
1235 Central Drive
Presque Isle, ME 04769
207-760-3134
Kathy.m.hoppe@maine.gov

Barb Welch
Maine Department of Environmental Protection
State House Station 17
Augusta, ME 04333
207-287-7682
Barb.welch@maine.gov

MDEP document number: DEPLW0747